

This is a provisional PDF only. Copyedited and fully formatted version will be made available soon.

REPORTS OF PRACTICAL ONCOLOGY AND RADIOTHERAPY

ISSN: 1507-1367

e-ISSN: 2083-4640

Radiotherapy for osteoblastoma: the 25-year institutional experience

Authors: Bartłomiej Szostakowski, Tadeusz Morysiński, Piotr Rutkowski, Mateusz Jacek Spalek

DOI: 10.5603/rpor.101993

Article type: Research paper

Published online: 2024-08-09

This article has been peer reviewed and published immediately upon acceptance. It is an open access article, which means that it can be downloaded, printed, and distributed freely, provided the work is properly cited.

Radiotherapy for osteoblastoma: the 25-year institutional experience

1Bartłomiej Szostakowski¹, Tadeusz Morysiński¹, Piotr Rutkowski¹, Mateusz Jacek Spalek^{1,2*}

2¹Department of Soft Tissue/Bone Sarcoma and Melanoma, Maria Skłodowska-Curie National

3Research Institute of Oncology, Warsaw, Poland

4²Department of Radiotherapy 1, Maria Skłodowska-Curie National Research Institute of Oncology,

5Warsaw, Poland

6* **Correspondence:**

7Mateusz Jacek Spalek, mateusz.spalek@nio.gov.pl

8**Keywords: osteoblastoma, bone tumor, radiotherapy, rare cancer, benign tumor**

91 Abstract

10**Introduction:** Osteoblastoma (OB) is a rare benign bone tumor, mainly affecting adolescents and
11young adults. It's commonly found in the spine and long bones, with a male-to-female ratio of 2:1.
12Surgery, primarily en bloc resection or curettage, is the main treatment. Radiotherapy (RT) or
13systemic treatment is considered in specific cases. However, optimal RT strategies remain unclear
14due to limited and outdated data. This study aims to evaluate RT role, efficacy, and safety in treating
15OB.

16**Method:** The study group was a cohort of consecutive patients with OB treated in our institute that
17received RT in years 1998-2023. We analyzed indication for RT, irradiated site, RT technique, total
18dose, dose per fraction, early and late tolerance, and survival.

19**Results:** Thirteen patients meeting the criteria were analyzed. Most were males (10 out of 13) with a
20median age of 21. Most OBs were within the vertebral column. All patients received definitive RT for
21unresectable disease and underwent conventionally fractionated RT (1.8-2.0 Gy per fraction) to total
22doses 40-70.2 Gy. Only mild acute toxicity was observed. No late toxicity was reported. The median
23follow-up was 118 months. Local progression was observed in four patients, all of whom died.

24**Conclusions:** RT is a valuable option for certain OB patients ineligible for surgery. Seeking
25treatment at specialized bone tumor centers with RT techniques is crucial due to OB's rarity and the
26lack of standardized guidelines. Recommended RT doses fall between 50-70 Gy using intensity-
27modulated techniques in conventional 1.8-2 Gy fractions.

282 Introduction

29Osteoblastoma (OB) is a rare benign tumor that can be locally aggressive. It accounts for
30approximately 3% of all benign bone tumors and 1% of primary bone tumors¹. The main differential
31diagnosis is osteosarcoma. OB has a reported male to female ratio of 2:1 and can occur in a wide age
32range, although it is most commonly observed in adolescents and young adults. It is rarely observed
33before the age of 10 or after the age of 30. OB is composed of osteoblasts that produce osteoid and
34bone. Its histology is usually similar to that of osteoid osteoma, from which it can be distinguished by
35symptoms and radiologic appearance. Osteoblastomas are also larger than 2 cm in diameter, whereas
36osteoid osteomas are usually less than 1.5 cm. The term 'benign OB' was first proposed by Jaffe and

37Lichtenstein in 1956^{2,3} to describe a benign tumor characterized by the abundant presence of
38osteoblasts, as well as vascular and bone-forming features. OB commonly occurs in the vertebral
39column [3], followed by long tubular bones where it is usually observed in the metadiaphysis, hands,
40feet, and ribs⁴. Another common site is the mandible, where it is referred to as cementoblastoma.

41According to Boriani et al., around 40% of OB occur in the spine, often leading to scoliosis,
42particularly in males⁵. Thoracic lesions are more prevalent than lumbar lesions, and neurological
43involvement is directly linked to erosion of the cortex. There is a tendency to form a soft tissue
44component that invades the spinal canal and affects the nerve roots. The pedicle and lamina are the
45areas more commonly affected than the body of the vertebra⁶.

46The main treatment for patients with OB is surgery. En bloc resection is the preferred approach, when
47possible, as it results in a lower risk of local recurrence or curettage, depending on the clinical
48situation, location within the bone, and suspicion of malignancy. In certain cases, local excision may
49be followed by adjuvant radiotherapy (RT) to complement surgical resection⁶.

50Systemic treatment should be reserved for cases where local treatment, including RT, is not possible
51or effective, or in rare situations where osteoblastoma has converted into osteosarcoma^{7,8}. In the case
52of benign OB, promising results have been achieved with denosumab^{9,10}. Malignant variants are
53usually treated with regimens used in osteosarcoma¹¹.

54Definitive RT, defined as treatment delivered to macroscopic disease, is a viable treatment option for
55residual, unresectable or recurrent osteoblastoma^{12,13}. However, the optimal indications,
56fractionation, total dose and RT technique remain unknown due to lack of data. The available
57publications are mostly case reports. Furthermore, most of the data are outdated and do not include
58recent developments in radiation oncology. The aim of this study is to evaluate the indications,
59efficacy and safety of RT in patients with OB treated at a tertiary sarcoma center.

603 **Method**

61A retrospective review of a cohort of consecutive patients with a diagnosis of OB confirmed by
62central pathology review by experienced bone tumor pathologists. All patients received definitive RT
63at our institution between 1998 and 2023. Clinical data were obtained from medical records and the
64RT planning system (when available).

65We performed a search of all available electronic medical records using MedStream Designer
66software from Transition Technologies. We analyzed the following parameters: indication for RT,
67irradiated site, total dose, dose per fraction, RT techniques, target volumes, organs at risk, early and
68late toxicity, local control, and survival. Toxicity was graded according to the Common Terminology
69Criteria for Adverse Events 5.0. All available records were independently reviewed by two coauthors.
70Missing data on date of death were obtained from the National Cancer Registry when available.
71Patients with missing data were excluded from the analysis.

72Follow-up time was calculated using the reverse Kaplan-Meier method. Data analysis was performed
73using the R software environment, version 4.3.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
74Austria) and the jamovi project, version 2.3.28 (obtained from <https://www.jamovi.org>, Sydney,
75Australia).

764 **Results**

774.1 Patients' characteristics

78 We found 83 patients who were treated or consulted for osteoblastoma between 1998 and 2023. Of
79 these, thirteen patients met the inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Of these, ten were male and three were
80 female. The median age was 21 years, with a minimum of 17 years and a maximum of 68 years. All
81 but three of the OBs were located within the vertebral column. Patient characteristics are summarized
82 in Table 1.

834.2 Radiotherapy parameters

84 All patients received definitive RT for unresectable disease, mostly in the thoracic and lumbar spine.
85 All patients received conventionally fractionated RT (1.8-2.0 Gy per fraction) for total doses ranging
86 from 40-70.2 Gy. Seven patients were treated with older RT techniques, namely two-dimensional and
87 three-dimensional static RT, while six patients were treated with intensity-modulated techniques,
88 which allow better sparing of organs at risk, especially the spinal cord (see Figure 2). All RT-related
89 parameters are shown in Table 2.

904.3 Toxicity and efficacy

91 RT appeared to be well tolerated. Only grade 1 and 2 skin and gastrointestinal toxicities were
92 reported in the medical records (Table 2). No significant late toxicity was reported.

93 The median follow-up was 117 [93 - not reached, 95% confidence interval] months. The
94 Kaplan-Meier plot for follow-up is shown in Figure 3. Four patients showed local progression
95 and, unfortunately, all of them died. Two of these patients also developed distant metastases
96 and were treated with chemotherapy. The remaining two patients underwent salvage surgery.
97 The oldest patient in our cohort died of unknown causes at the age of 76 years. He died eight
98 years after RT with no evidence of disease progression. Eight patients had no evidence of
99 disease at the longest recurrence-free survival time of twelve years. All data are summarized in
100 Table 3.

1015 Discussion and conclusions

102 This study presents the largest cohort of patients with OB who underwent definitive RT. Our analysis
103 shows that RT enables high local control with excellent treatment tolerance. Although a review of the
104 available literature shows that RT is rarely used for definitive treatment of OB, some authors
105 advocate the use of RT after intralesional curettage to aid surgical excision^{7,12-16}. In all of the
106 aforementioned reports, the authors described a similar efficacy and favorable toxicity profile of RT.
107 Recurrence-free survival of up to 25 years after adjuvant RT for osteoblastoma has been reported in
108 the literature^{14,16}.

109 One may wonder why two patients in our cohort developed distant metastases in the case of benign
110 tumor. The first explanation could be the misdiagnosis of the primary tumor, which could have been
111 misdiagnosed as osteosarcoma, especially osteoblastoma-like osteosarcoma. The differential
112 diagnosis of osteoblastoma-like osteosarcoma from OB is challenging but crucial due to dramatically
113 different clinical behavior and high risk of metastatic spread^{17,18}. Another scenario is related to the
114 rare phenomenon of malignant transformation of OB to osteosarcoma that has been described in the
115 literature⁸. However, we are unable to confirm any of these hypotheses due to the lack of secondary
116 biopsies after disease progression and the lack of formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded blocks that were
117 sent for consultation and returned to the primary pathology laboratory.

118 This study has limitations. The sample of patients obtained may not accurately represent the entire
119 population of patients with OB due to selection bias resulting from the retrospective nature of the
120 analysis. To mitigate this bias, two coauthors (BS, MJS) independently reviewed all data. However,
121 due to the retrospective approach and events spanning decades, there is a significant risk of
122 incomplete or misinterpreted data. This risk is compounded by changes in diagnostic tools, RT
123 techniques, and treatment modalities over the past 25 years. As a result, our cohort may not be a true
124 reflection of the current population. In addition, it was difficult to determine why some patients
125 received a higher total dose than others, especially those who received only 40 Gy, which,
126 interestingly, allowed for long-term local control. In addition, the retrospective assessment of toxicity
127 is based solely on written physician observations, which may have been very brief, especially in the
128 case of late toxicity. The recommended follow-up regimen for non-malignant tumors at our center is
129 at least every six months for two years, followed by once a year for the next few years. Importantly,
130 in the case of severe toxicity, physicians usually report it accurately. However, the results of the
131 analysis should be interpreted with caution. Although the study has limitations, it provides valuable
132 insights for multidisciplinary teams considering RT as a treatment for a patient with OB.

133 Future research on the role of RT for OB should focus on two unresolved aspects. First, we have no
134 data on the role of innovative RT approaches in OB, namely stereotactic body RT (SBRT) and
135 particle therapy¹⁹. SBRT has been shown to be an effective and safe way to treat metastases from
136 radioresistant tumors, such as kidney cancer or bone sarcomas, as well as radioresistant benign
137 tumors located near vital organs at risk²⁰⁻²³. Furthermore, SBRT seems to be a more cost-effective
138 and convenient option than conventionally fractionated RT^{24,25}. Unfortunately, there are no published
139 data on the role of SBRT in OB.

140 Other interesting options for patients with OB, especially when tumor is close to the critical nervous
141 structures, could be protons and heavy ions. They show a phenomenon called a "Bragg peak"²⁶. This
142 means that these particles put most of their energy into the last part of their path as they slow down.
143 Attiah et al. presented a case of a patient with OB of the temporal bone who underwent gross total
144 resection followed by adjuvant proton therapy²⁷. Heavy ions may be useful in the treatment of
145 radioresistant and slow-growing tumors such as OB²⁸. This is due to their higher linear energy
146 transfer, less dependence on hypoxia, and ability to cause more double-strand breaks in DNA. Honda
147 et al. reported a case of a lumbar multiple recurrent OB who underwent successful carbon ion therapy
148 with ten years of follow-up without disease progression and significant late toxicity²⁹.

149 The second aforementioned area for further research is contouring. Currently, there is no consensus
150 or established recommendations for contouring in RT for OB. This is due to the complexity of
151 contouring caused by the different radiological presentations of OB. At a minimum, contouring
152 should be based on planning computed tomography and planning magnetic resonance imaging. The
153 question of whether to include an elective margin for subclinical disease spread that cannot be fully
154 imaged remains unanswered.

155 In conclusion, RT is a valuable treatment option in selected patients with OB who are ineligible for
156 definitive surgery or where the size or location of the tumor is not amenable to surgical resection.
157 Due to the rarity of OB and the lack of recommendations, it is highly recommended that patients be
158 treated at tertiary bone tumor centers with access to modern RT techniques. Total doses between 50-
159 70 Gy in conventional 1.8-2 Gy fractions delivered with dose intensity modulation techniques should
160 be considered as the recommended approach.

1616 **Figures**

162 **Figure 1. Data extraction flow chart**

163 **Figure 2. Radiotherapy planning in a patient with osteoblastoma; (A) tumor delineation based**
 164 **on planning computed tomography (A1) with planning magnetic resonance imaging (A2); (B)**
 165 **volumetric modulated arc therapy plan, the dose distribution of 56 Gy in 2 Gy fractions in**
 166 **transversal (B1) and coronal views (B2), 95% of the prescribed dose (53.2 Gy)**

167 **Figure 3. Reverse Kaplan-Meier plot for follow-up**

168

1697 **Tables**170 **Table 1. Patients' characteristics**

Patient number	Gender	Age at diagnosis	Date of diagnosis	Tumor site	Treatment before radiotherapy	Clinical situation	Start of radiotherapy
1	male	31	09.1999	thoracic spine	none	unresectable primary	11.1999
2	female	21	03.2000	thoracic spine	surgery	unresectable recurrence	07.2003
3	male	32	10.2008	lumbar spine	surgery	unresectable recurrence	02.2010
4	female	17	02.2009	pelvis	surgery	unresectable recurrence	11.2011
5	male	17	10.2009	thoracic spine	surgery	unresectable recurrence	05.2010
6	female	19	05.2010	thoracic spine	none	unresectable primary	12.2010
7	male	27	02.2012	lumbar spine	surgery	unresectable recurrence	08.2012
8	male	68	02.2012	phalanx	none	unresectable primary (refused amputation)	07.2012
9	male	19	10.2012	pelvis	macroscopically non-radical (R2) surgery	remaining tumor	04.2013
10	male	48	11.2012	lumbar spine	macroscopically non-radical (R2) surgery	remaining tumor	08.2013
11	male	19	01.2013	tibia	surgery	unresectable recurrence	06.2013
12	male	46	11.2014	lumbar spine	none	unresectable primary	06.2015
13	male	19	06.2022	thoracic spine	none	unresectable primary	01.2023

171

172 **Table 2. Radiotherapy parameters and acute toxicity**

Patient number	Technique	FD [Gy]	TD [Gy]	CTV [cm ³]	PTV [cm ³]	CTV-PTV margin [cm]	Number of fields or arcs	Imaging	Spinal cord with margin maximum in 0.035	Volume of small bowel that receive	Acute toxicity [grade]
----------------	-----------	---------	---------	------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------	--	------------------------------------	------------------------

									cm ³ [Gy]	d 45 Gy or more [cm ³]	
1	Co-60 + electrons	2	56	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	nausea G2 vomiting G2
2	2D-RT	1.8	50.4	ND	ND	ND	3	MV	ND	ND	none
3	IMRT	1.8	70.2	ND	2171.7 8	ND	9	kV	40.2	516	skin G1
4	3D-CRT	2	70	19.53	89.2	1	3	kV	ND	ND	skin G1
5	IMRT	2	70	ND	627.96	ND	9	kV	41.2	ND	skin G2 mucosal G1
6	IMRT	2	70	ND	173.54	ND	7	kV	32	ND	skin G2
7	IMRT	1.8	50.4	1122	1307.9 9	0.3	7	MV	ND	6.7	diarrhea G1
8	3D-CRT	2	50	40.79	74.39	0.5	2	MV	ND	ND	none
9	3D-CRT	2	50	563.5 1	976.24	1	5	kV	ND	152.3	skin G2
10	3D-CRT	2	40*	739.3 1	977.04	0.5	4	kV	ND	ND	none
11	3D-CRT	2	50	344.8	514.2	0.5	2	kV	ND	ND	skin G1
12	IMRT	1.8	50.4	527.8 9	728.42	0.7	9	kV	44.9	ND	skin G2
13	VMAT	2	56	332.1 3	451.88	0.3	3	CBCT	44.2	ND	skin G1

173**Abbreviations:** 2D-RT – two-dimensional radiotherapy; 3D-CRT – three-dimensional conformal
174radiotherapy; CBCT – cone beam computed tomography; CTV – clinical target volume; FD –
175fraction dose; IMRT – intensity modulated radiotherapy; kV – kilovoltage portal imaging; MV –
176megavoltage portal imaging; ND – no data; PTV – planning target volume; TD – total dose; VMAT –
177volumetric modulated arc therapy

178* - The dose may be reduced by the treating radiation oncologist due to the length of the target
179volume (the entire lumbar spine) and the associated proximity of the bowel; however, this is only the
180authors' hypothesis.

181

182**Table 3. Efficacy and survival**

Patient number	Local progression	Date of local progression	Distant metastases	Date of distant relapse	Salvage treatment	Survival at the last follow-up	Date of death or last follow-up
1	yes	12.2000	yes	12.2000	CHT*	DOD	02.2002
2	yes	08.2013	no		surgery	DOD	08.2021
3	yes	05.2013	yes	02.2014	CHT#	DOD	02.2014
4	no		no			NED	07.2022
5	yes	02.2011	no		surgery	DOD	03.2012
6	no		no			NED	03.2023
7	no		no			NED	08.2022
8	no		no			DOO	03.2020
9	no		no			NED	04.2023
10	no		no			NED	01.2021
11	no		no			NED	10.2021
12	no		no			NED	04.2023
13	no		no			NED	09.2023

183**Abbreviations:** CHT – chemotherapy; DOD – dead of disease; DOO – dead of other; NED – no
184evidence of disease

185* - First line: doxorubicin, cisplatin; second line: doxorubicin, ifosfamide

186# - First line: doxorubicin, cisplatin; second line: gemcitabine

1878 **References**

1881. Atesok KI., Alman BA., Schemitsch EH., Peyser A., Mankin H. Osteoid osteoma and
189osteoblastoma. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2011;**19**(11):678–89. Doi: 10.5435/00124635-201111000-
19000004.

1912. Jaffe HL. Benign osteoblastoma. *Bull Hosp Joint Dis* 1956;**17**(2):141–51.

1923. Lichtenstein L. Benign osteoblastoma; a category of osteoid-and bone-forming tumors other
193than classical osteoid osteoma, which may be mistaken for giant-cell tumor or osteogenic sarcoma.
194*Cancer* 1956;**9**(5):1044–52. Doi: 10.1002/1097-0142(195609/10)9:5<1044::aid-
195cncr2820090523>3.0.co;2-o.

1964. Limaiem F., Byerly DW., Mabrouk A., Singh R. Osteoblastoma. *StatPearls*, Treasure Island
197(FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023.

1985. Boriani S., Capanna R., Donati D., Levine A., Picci P., Savini R. Osteoblastoma of the spine.
199*Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1992;(278):37–45.

2006. Galgano MA., Goulart CR., Iwenofu H., Chin LS., Lavelle W., Mendel E. Osteoblastomas of
201the spine: a comprehensive review. *Neurosurg Focus* 2016;**41**(2):E4. Doi:
20210.3171/2016.5.FOCUS16122.

2037. Berberoglu S., Oguz A., Aribal E., Ataoglu O. Osteoblastoma response to radiotherapy and
204chemotherapy. *Med Pediatr Oncol* 1997;**28**(4):305–9. Doi: 10.1002/(sici)1096-
205911x(199704)28:4<304::aid-mpo11>3.0.co;2-c.

2068. Mesfin A., Boriani S., Gambarotti M., Bandiera S., Gasbarrini A. Can Osteoblastoma Evolve
207to Malignancy? A Challenge in the Decision-Making Process of a Benign Spine Tumor. *World*
208*Neurosurgery* 2020;**136**:150–6. Doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2019.11.148.

2099. Yamaga K., Kuwamoto S., Tanishima S., et al. An unresectable osteoblastoma of the axis
210controlled with denosumab. *Orthop Sci* 2024;**29**(1):379–83. Doi: 10.1016/j.jos.2022.02.010.

21110. Kooner P., Ferguson P. The Use of Denosumab in Osteoblastoma of the Metacarpal. *J Hand*
212*Surg Am* 2019;**44**(11):994.e1-994.e6. Doi: 10.1016/j.jhssa.2019.02.001.

21311. Strauss SJ., Frezza AM., Abecassis N., et al. Bone sarcomas: ESMO–EURACAN–
214GENTURIS–ERN PaedCan Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up☆.
215*Annals of Oncology* 2021;**32**(12):1520–36. Doi: 10.1016/j.annonc.2021.08.1995.

21612. Singer JM., Deutsch GP. The successful use of radiotherapy for osteoblastoma. *Clinical*
217*Oncology* 1993;**5**(2):124–5. Doi: 10.1016/S0936-6555(05)80867-2.

21813. Miszczyk L., Wozniak G., Walichiewicz P., Spindel J. Radiotherapy in the treatment of
219osteoblastoma - a report of five consecutive cases. *Nowotwory* 2004;**54**(1):31–3.

22014. Capanna R., Ayala A., Bertoni F., et al. Sacral osteoid osteoma and osteoblastoma: a report of
22113 cases. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg (1978)* 1986;**105**(4):205–10. Doi: 10.1007/BF00435481.

22215. Boriani S., Amendola L., Bandiera S., et al. Staging and treatment of osteoblastoma in the

- 223mobile spine: a review of 51 cases. *Eur Spine J* 2012;**21**(10):2003–10. Doi: 10.1007/s00586-012-2242395-8.
22516. Singh DK., Das KK., Mehrotra A., et al. Aggressive osteoblastoma involving the 226craniovertebral junction: A case report and review of literature. *J Craniovertebr Junction Spine* 2272013;**4**(2):69–72. Doi: 10.4103/0974-8237.128533.
22817. Bertoni F., Bacchini P., Donati D., Martini A., Picci P., Campanacci M. Osteoblastoma-like 229osteosarcoma. The Rizzoli Institute experience. *Mod Pathol* 1993;**6**(6):707–16.
23018. Ozger H., Alpan B., Söylemez MS., et al. Clinical management of a challenging malignancy, 231osteoblastoma-like osteosarcoma: a report of four cases and a review of the literature. *Ther Clin Risk* 232*Manag* 2016;**12**:1261–70. Doi: 10.2147/TCRM.S102966.
23319. Malicki J., Piotrowski T., Guedea F., Krengli M. Treatment-integrated imaging, radiomics, 234and personalised radiotherapy: the future is at hand. *Reports of Practical Oncology and* 235*Radiotherapy* 2022;**27**(4):734–43. Doi: 10.5603/RPOR.a2022.0071.
23620. Gerszten PC., Quader M., Novotny J., Flickinger JC. Radiosurgery for benign tumors of the 237spine: clinical experience and current trends. *Technol Cancer Res Treat* 2012;**11**(2):133–9. Doi: 23810.7785/tcrt.2012.500242.
23921. Spalek MJ., Teterycz P., Borkowska A., Poleszczuk J., Rutkowski P. Stereotactic radiotherapy 240for soft tissue and bone sarcomas: real-world evidence. *Ther Adv Med Oncol* 2412022;**14**:17588359211070646. Doi: 10.1177/17588359211070646.
24222. Wolf RJ., Winkler V., Mattke M., Uhl M., Debus J. Intensity-modulated radiotherapy for the 243management of primary and recurrent chordomas: a retrospective long-term follow-up study. *Reports* 244*of Practical Oncology and Radiotherapy* 2023;**28**(2):207–16. Doi: 10.5603/RPOR.a2023.0022.
24523. Iii SM., Sun Y., Spratt DE. Spine Patient Optimal Radiosurgery Treatment for Symptomatic 246Metastatic Neoplasms (SPORTSMEN): a randomized phase II study protocol. *Reports of Practical* 247*Oncology and Radiotherapy* 2023;**28**(3):379–88. Doi: 10.5603/RPOR.a2023.0037.
24824. Shaverdian N., Wang P-C., Steinberg M., Lee P. The patient’s perspective on stereotactic 249body radiation therapy (SBRT) vs. surgery for treatment of early stage non-small cell lung cancer 250(NSCLC). *Lung Cancer* 2015;**90**(2):230–3. Doi: 10.1016/j.lungcan.2015.07.009.
25125. Patel SA., Switchenko JM., Fischer-Valuck B., et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy versus 252conventional/moderate fractionated radiation therapy with androgen deprivation therapy for 253unfavorable risk prostate cancer. *Radiation Oncology* 2020;**15**(1):217. Doi: 10.1186/s13014-020-25401658-5.
25526. Byun HK., Han MC., Yang K., et al. Physical and Biological Characteristics of Particle 256Therapy for Oncologists. *Cancer Res Treat* 2021;**53**(3):611–20. Doi: 10.4143/crt.2021.066.
25727. Attiah M., Tucker AM., Perez-Rosendahl M., et al. Epithelioid Osteoblastoma of the 258Temporal Bone: A Case Report. *World Neurosurgery* 2019;**123**:378–82. Doi: 25910.1016/j.wneu.2018.11.209.
26028. Pompos A., Durante M., Choy H. Heavy Ions in Cancer Therapy. *JAMA Oncol* 2612016;**2**(12):1539–40. Doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2016.2646.
26229. Honda A., Iizuka Y., Imai R., et al. Recurrent lumbar-origin osteoblastoma treated with 263multiple surgery and carbon ion radiotherapy: a case report. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 2642020;**21**(1):321. Doi: 10.1186/s12891-020-03349-4.

265

2669 Conflict of Interest

267The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
268relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

26910 Author Contributions

270All authors contributed to the conception and design. Conceptualization, B.S., M.J.S.; methodology,
271B.S., M.J.S.; software, M.J.S.; validation, P.R., M.J.S.; formal analysis, B.S., T.M., M.J.S.;
272investigation, B.S., M.J.S.; funding acquisition, M.J.S.; resources, T.M., M.J.S.; data curation, B.S.,
273M.J.S.; writing–original draft preparation, B.S., T.M., P.R., M.J.S.; writing–review and editing, B.S.,
274T.M., P.R., M.J.S; visualization, M.J.S.; supervision, P.R., M.J.S.; project administration, B.S., M.J.S.
275All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

27611 Funding

277This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
278not-for-profit sectors.

28912 Data Availability

290All data generated or analyzed during this study are available in the manuscript.